

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Tel.: (914) 749-8200
dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165
Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027
44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel.: (415) 293-6800
mmao@bsfllp.com
brichardson@bsfllp.com

James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)
Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)
100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel.: (305) 539-8400
jlee@bsfllp.com
rbaeza@bsfllp.com

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334
M. Logan Wright, CA Bar No. 349004
2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (213) 995-5720
alanderson@bsfllp.com
mwright@bsfllp.com

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)
Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice)
Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)
Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice)
Ryan Sila (admitted pro hac vice)
One Manhattan West, 50th Floor
New York, NY 10001
Tel.: (212) 336-8330
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
srabin@susmangodfrey.com
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
rsila@susmangodfrey.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel.: (310) 789-3100
abonn@susmangodfrey.com

MORGAN & MORGAN

John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice)
Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice)
Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Tel.: (813) 223-5505
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
rmcgee@forthepeople.com
mram@forthepeople.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, SAL
CATALDO, JULIAN
SANTIAGO, and SUSAN LYNN
HARVEY, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No.: 3:20-cv-04688-RS

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
GOOGLE'S MIL NO. 5 RE: GOOGLE'S
PRIVACY COMMITMENTS,
PRACTICES, AND THE HISTORY AND
DEVELOPMENT OF WEB & APP
ACTIVITY**

The Honorable Richard Seeborg
Date: July 30, 2025
Time: 9:30 a.m.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD 2

III. ARGUMENT 3

 A. Google Employees’ Admissions of Google’s Broken
 Protections for User Privacy 3

 B. Sundar Pichai’s Promises of control and Employees’ Criticisms 6

 C. Google’s Internal Reaction to the Public Revelation of a Privacy
 and Consent Failure Involving Web & App Activity 12

 D. History and Development of the Web & App Activity Privacy
 Controls 14

IV. CONCLUSION 16

I. INTRODUCTION

Google's fifth motion in limine, concerning what it self-servingly calls evidence of "products outside the scope" of this case, should be denied. Google's four-page motion contains none of the necessary detail to warrant excluding the 33 at-issue exhibits before trial even begins. Google hardly engages with the exhibits themselves. Excluding citations, the Argument section of Google's brief contains fewer sentences (23) than the number of exhibits it targets. To the extent that Google's motion addresses the exhibits at all, it either states Google's own slanted perspective about them or gets them wrong entirely. That does not support exclusion.

A careful review of the exhibits targeted in this motion reveals that they are relevant to many issues that will be tried, such as Google's state of mind, users' expectations of privacy, and the offensiveness of Google's conduct. The exhibits can be sorted into four categories:

1. Google Employees' Admissions of Google's Broken Protections for User Privacy.¹

Google seeks to exclude notes from Google's internal interviews, in which the company's privacy employees and executives criticized the state of user privacy at Google. In these interviews, Google's employees admitted, among other things, that

Google's employees' statements are relevant to many of the issues in dispute, including Google's state of mind, its purported limitations on the use of (s)WAA-off app activity data, users' expectations with respect to privacy online, and the offensiveness of Google's conduct.

2. Sundar Pichai's Promises of Control and Employees' Criticisms:²

Google seeks to exclude repeated public statements made by its CEO, Sundar Pichai, promising that users control the data that Google collects. This includes false sworn congressional testimony promising that Google offers its users a "toggle" that allows them to decide whether Google collects mobile data. As the record in this case proves, Google uses the Firebase and Google Mobile Ads SDKs to violate users' choice. Behind closed doors, Google employees criticized Mr. Pichai's statements. Mr. Pichai's public campaign contributed to users' reasonable expectation of privacy when they exercised the control they were offered. This evidence also speaks to Google's state of mind and the offensiveness of its conduct.

¹ Dkt. 478-32 (PX-6).

² Santacana Ex. D (PX-28); Dkt. 478-25 (PX-217); Santacana Ex. E (PX-132); Dkt. 478-35 (PX-249) Santacana Ex. C (PX-250); Dkt. 479-41 (PX-133); Dkt. 478-34 (PX-244); Santacana Ex. F (PX-134).

3. **Google’s Internal Reaction to the Public Revelation of a Privacy Failure Involving Web & App Activity:**³ In 2018, the Associated Press published an article revealing that Google uses the Web & App Activity privacy controls to collect users’ location data, even when they choose to turn off the Location History setting. Google seeks to exclude evidence that its executives devoted significant time to Google’s response, which is relevant for several reasons. It shows that executives recognized that the issue is serious—violating users’ privacy choices is highly offensive to the public. It also shows that Google executives were knowledgeable about the Web & App Activity privacy controls, which goes to Google’s state of mind regarding its false promises of control.

4. **The History and Development of the Web & App Activity Privacy Controls:**⁴ Google seeks to exclude evidence regarding the creation of the Web & App Activity privacy controls as they exist today, as well as their development since. This evidence shows that senior executives at Google were involved at every step. That bears on the importance of this setting to Google and its users. And given the enhanced scrutiny applied when executives are involved, it also diminishes the likelihood that Google’s privacy failures were inadvertent.

Google does not identify any particular danger in allowing this evidence to be presented to the jury. Its principal argument is that these exhibits “do[] not relate to the allegations at issue in this case,” Mot. at 5, which is both untrue and not germane to the question of prejudice. There is no reason to believe that the jury is incapable of assigning this evidence the appropriate weight. Google’s motion should be denied.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“To exclude evidence on a motion in limine, the evidence must be inadmissible on all potential grounds.” *Thunder Studios, Inc. v. Kazal*, 2018 WL 11346849, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2018) (citation omitted). “Unless a party can meet this ‘high standard,’ evidentiary rulings should be deferred until trial because ‘a court is almost always better situated during the actual trial to assess the value and utility of the evidence.’” *L.D. v. EzyRoller, LLC*, 2024 WL 5416670, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2024) (citation omitted). Moreover, Rule 403 “is an extraordinary remedy to be used sparingly.” *United States v. Mende*, 43 F.3d 1298, 1302 (9th Cir. 1995). Rule 403

³ Dkt. 478-14 (PX-195); Dkt. 478-13 (PX-198); Dkt. 478-16 (PX-199); Dkt. 478-17 (PX-200); Dkt. 478-18 (PX-201); Dkt. 478-20 (PX-202); Dkt. 478-15 (PX-204); Santacana Ex. B (PX-207); Dkt. 478-21 (PX-208); Dkt. 478-22 (PX-210); Dkt. 478-19 (PX-215); Dkt. 479-37 (PX-221); Dkt. 479-36 (PX-233); Dkt. 478-33 (PX-236); Dkt. 478-30 (PX-263); Dkt. 478-28 (PX-273); Dkt. 478-27 (PX-277).

⁴ Dkt. 478-1 (PX-152); Dkt. 478-2 (PX-153); Dkt. 478-3 (PX-154); Dkt. 479-35 (PX-226); Dkt. 478-26 (PX-243); Dkt. 478-34 (PX-244); Dkt. 478-28 (PX-273); Dkt. 478-27 (PX-277).

1 authorizes exclusion when “the danger of prejudice [does] not merely outweigh the probative value
2 of the evidence, but *substantially* outweigh[s] it.” *Id.* (emphasis in original).

3 **III. ARGUMENT**

4 The Court should deny Google’s motion in full. For ease of comprehension, Plaintiffs
5 address the exhibits in four categories: (1) Google employees’ admissions of Google’s broken
6 protections for user privacy; (2) Sundar Pichai’s promises of control (and employees’ criticisms);
7 (3) Google’s internal reaction to the public revelation of a privacy failure involving Web & App
8 Activity; and (4) the history and development of the Web & App Activity privacy controls. The
9 exhibits in each category are relevant to the issues at trial, and Google fails to identify specific and
10 material prejudice these documents may cause.

11 **A. Google Employees’ Admissions of Google’s Broken Protections for User 12 Privacy**

13 Without saying so, Google first seeks to exclude evidence of widespread concern amongst
14 privacy stakeholders at Google about the company’s approach to consent and user privacy. In
15 moving to exclude PX-6, Google falsely represents that the document comprises “public
16 statements by Mr. Pichai about Google’s general privacy practices.” Mot. 4 (including PX-6 in
17 this category). It very clearly does not. *See* Dkt. 478-32 (PX-6). PX-6 is [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]

21 The stated mission of the [REDACTED] program was [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]

24 Mao Ex. 19 (PX-309) at 1. As part of this initiative, Google
25 interviewed dozens of stakeholders within Google. PX-6 reflects notes from those interviews. Dkt.
26 478-32 (PX-6); Mao Ex. 20 (Heft-Luthy Tr.) at 121:5–17. The interviewees’ responses—about
27 topics including but by no means limited to [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]—are critically important. They bear on issues like Google’s state of mind, the
 2 reasonableness of users’ expectation of privacy, the consistency of Google’s conduct with social
 3 norms, the offensiveness of Google’s conduct, and more.

4 Take, for example, notes of the [REDACTED] team’s interview with **David Monsees**, who
 5 Google describes as the product manager for the Web & App Activity (“(s)WAA”) privacy
 6 controls. In his interview, Mr. Monsees said that he “[REDACTED]” at
 7 Google. Dkt. 478-32 (PX-6) at -883. Mr. Monsees also admitted that [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]. *Id.* at -884. Asked whether [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]. Monsees
 10 said: [REDACTED] *Id.* (emphasis added). His answer supports
 11 the conclusion that Google does not offer users a choice over collection of their data, which is a
 12 requirement to establish legal consent. And Google’s apparent belief that users don’t deserve a
 13 choice—despite repeated public statements to the contrary, *see infra*—heightens the offensiveness
 14 of its conduct. Mr. Monsees also [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] *See id.* at -882, -885 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]

18 The [REDACTED] team also interviewed **Bryan Horling**, David Monsees’s boss, who
 19 admitted that [REDACTED].” *Id.* at -898. That
 20 admission illustrates the stakes of Google’s data collection practices, as well as the offensiveness
 21 of Google’s decision to collect user data even when people turn off the Web & App Activity
 22 privacy controls. Another stakeholder said that [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED] *Id.* at -887. The fact that
 24 users care deeply about Google’s honesty, as well as their power to say no to data collection,
 25 strongly supports a finding that Google’s conduct is highly offensive and an egregious breach of
 26 social norms for purposes of the privacy tort claims—even setting aside the intimacy of app
 27 activity data that Google collects.

1 In several interviews, senior privacy executives suggested that Google [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]. **Stephan**
 3 **Micklitz**, the director of engineering for Google's Privacy and Data Protection Office, said that
 4 Google "[REDACTED]"
 5 [REDACTED] *Id.* at -896 (emphasis
 6 added). **Rahul Roy-Chowdhury**, who was responsible for Google's long-term privacy strategy,
 7 similarly said that Google was [REDACTED]
 8 in part because [REDACTED] *Id.* at -
 9 930. These admissions should rightfully cause the jury to doubt Google's assurances that it does
 10 not use (s)WAA-off app activity data for certain purposes, like personalized advertising.

11 Many interviewees described Google's culture of what certainly appears to be disrespect
 12 for user privacy. One product manager working on privacy issues at Google expressed his view
 13 that "[REDACTED]." *Id.* at -877. Others expressed that [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]. **Othar Hansson**, who led the product team for the
 17 Privacy and Data Protection Office, said that [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED] *Id.* at -914, 917.
 19 He continued: [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED] *Id.* He explained that [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED] These statements reflect on Google's motives and intent. And Google's conduct is all the
 24 more offensive because it is a symptom of known problems with company culture.

25 Google's only claim of prejudice is the inverse of its argument with respect to relevance---
 26 that because these statements are purportedly irrelevant, they are prejudicial. *See* Mot. 5. But this
 27 argument is deeply misguided. Although Google has sometimes described [REDACTED] as a
 28 "general privacy project," Dkt. 266 at 5, Google's overall privacy practices by definition include

its conduct in this case. For example, when Google’s executives admit [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED], that makes it more likely that Google’s conduct in this case breaches
 social norms. And when those executives admit that [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED], that undermines Google’s assertion that it uses (s)WAA-off app activity data only for
 benign “record-keeping” purposes. For that reason, this Court previously rejected Google’s efforts
 to block discovery into the [REDACTED] project. See Dkt. 299 (ordering Mr. Heft-Luthy’s
 deposition); see also Dkt. 266 at 5 (Google’s objection to deposition of Mr. Heft-Luthy, on the
 ground that he “worked on general privacy projects” such as “[REDACTED]”). Moreover,
 discovery showed that the [REDACTED] project in fact focused on the Web & App Activity
 privacy controls, because they are some of the main culprits of Google’s failed approach to
 privacy. See, e.g. Mao Ex. 21 (PX-18) at 2 ([REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]). The notion that Google’s own employees’ opinions about
 privacy, users’ expectations, and the limitations of Google’s privacy infrastructure can be excised
 from this case is folly.

B. Sundar Pichai’s Promises of control and Employees’ Criticisms

Next, Google seeks to exclude evidence of various public statements made by its Chief
 Executive Officer, Sundar Pichai, and Google employees’ reactions to them. Mr. Pichai’s
 relentless campaign to instill in the public a sense of control over what Google collects, especially
 by using “toggles” like the (s)WAA toggle at issue in this case, is highly relevant to the
 reasonableness of class members’ expectation of privacy and lack of consent or permission. That
 the evidence shows Google’s conduct in this case proved these promises false—and that Google
 employees knew it—supports a finding that Google’s conduct was highly offensive. There is no
 merit to Google’s claim of prejudice, which depends entirely on Google’s false and unsupported
 assertion that Mr. Pichai’s public statements do not relate to app activity data.

PX-28 is a transcript of Mr. Pichai’s testimony before Congress on December 11, 2018,
 which contributed to the public perception that Google allows its users to choose what data—

1 including app activity data—they allow Google to save. At the top of the hearing, the Chair of the
 2 House Judiciary Committee pressed Mr. Pichai about the “volume of detailed information” that
 3 Google was “collect[ing]” from “smartphones,” Mr. Pichai assured everyone that this data
 4 collection is within Google users’ control. Santacana Ex. D (PX-28) at 22:22–23:18. He testified:

5 *[Y]ou have a choice of what information is collected, and we make*
 6 *it transparent. ... [I]n the last 28 days, 160 million users went to —*
 7 *went to their My Account settings where they can clearly see what*
 8 *information we have. We actually give, you know, show it back to*
 9 *them, and we give clear toggles, by category, where they can decide*
 10 *whether that information is collected, stored.*

11 *Id.* at 23:24, 24:17–25:2 (emphasis added). Mr. Pichai’s testimony was crystal-clear: For each
 12 category of information, there is a toggle that allows Google’s users to decide whether that
 13 information is collected. The “category” of data at issue in this case is app activity data. The only
 14 “toggles” that purport to control whether Google collects app activity data are the (s)WAA privacy
 15 controls. Mr. Pichai later doubled down, testifying that his promise applies to app activity data. *Id.*
 16 at 174:4–8 (“Q. So if you get an app that gathers information on a specific thing, that’s not also
 17 coming to Google as well as, to the — the developer of the app? A. In a general sense, no.”). As
 18 the record in this case proves, Google uses the Firebase and Google Mobile Ads Software
 19 Development Kits to violate these repeated promises.

20 PX-217 is a group chat between several Google product managers—including David
 21 Monsees, Google’s product manager in charge of the (s)WAA privacy controls, Sam Heft-Luthy,
 22 a product manager in Google’s Privacy and Data Protection Office, and others — [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]. Dkt. 478-25 (PX-217). [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED] *Id.* In his deposition, Mr.

25 Heft-Luthy [REDACTED]
 26 [REDACTED]
 27 [REDACTED]. See Dkt. 478-37 (Heft-Luthy Tr.) at 97:17–99:9, 100:21–104:24. The jury should
 28 be free to draw the obvious inference that Mr. Heft-Luthy’s opinions would be damaging to
 Google’s defense.

PX-132 is a New York Times op-ed written by Sundar Pichai, titled “Privacy Should Not Be a Luxury Good.” Santacana Ex. E (PX-132). In that article, Mr. Pichai repeated the themes from his congressional testimony. *Id.* at 3 (“[W]e give you clear, meaningful choices around your data. . . . [Y]ou get to decide how your information is used.”). Mr. Pichai also wrote about his own views of the “social norms” around privacy, which the jury will consider with respect to the privacy tort claims. *In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.*, 956 F.3d 589, 601–02 (9th Cir. 2020) (“We first consider whether a defendant gained access to data by electronic or other covert means, in violation of the law or social norms.”). Mr. Pichai admitted that “[p]eople today are rightly

concerned about how their information is used and shared,” that privacy is “one of the most important topics of our time,” and that it is “vital for companies to give people clear, individual choices around how their data is used.” Santacana Ex. E (PX-132) at 1–2. These statements help the jury to understand what the relevant social norms are. And Google’s conduct in this case is especially offensive because it is inconsistent with the ideas that its own CEO, in the pages of the New York Times, argued are good, just, integral to the company he leads.

PX-249 and 250 are internal emails amongst Google employees discussing Mr. Pichai’s New York Times article. Santacana Ex. C (PX-250); Dkt. 478-35 (PX-249). In these emails, employees recognized that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. See Santacana Ex. C (PX-250) at -579

(“[REDACTED]”). Their comments reflected internal

disagreement with Mr. Pichai’s public representations about the clarity and meaningfulness of the choices Google offers to its users, including the Web & App Activity privacy controls.

PX-133 is another article written by Sundar Pichai, this one titled “Keeping your information private.” Dkt. 479-41 (PX-133). In this article, Mr. Pichai once again represented that “[p]rivacy is at the heart of everything we [Google] do” and that one of Google’s “three important principles” is “putting you in control.” *Id.* at 1–2. That promise—and its repetition—give rise to an objectively reasonable expectation of privacy when users exercise the privacy controls that Google offers, such as the Web & App Activity privacy controls. This particular article also describes how even with Web & App Activity on, your activity data will be automatically and continuously deleted after 18 months” because “products should keep your information for only as long as it’s useful and helpful to you.” *Id.* at 2. That is relevant for two reasons. First, because these retention controls affect what is saved in the user’s account, it reinforces the false expectation that if information is not saved in the user’s account, it is not saved anywhere. And second, it falsely suggests that Google does not save app activity data from users who *never* found that data useful, *i.e.*, those who turned off the Web & App Activity privacy controls.

PX-244 is a set of talking points that were drafted for Mr. Pichai for use during a public conference. Dkt. 478-34 (PX-244). These talking points provide that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] *Id.* at -765. This document further supports some of the most important distinctions in this case: between “on” and “off,” and between “in your account” and “deleted” or never collected in the first place. *Id.* It reinforces that the Web & App Activity settings are about *all* of the data Google keeps about a user, not just the data it decides to categorize as within the user’s account.

PX-134 is written testimony that Mr. Pichai provided in the House Judiciary Committee’s July 29, 2020 hearing on online platforms and market power. Santacana Ex. F (PX-134). Mr. Pichai wrote that he “always believed that privacy is a universal right and should be available to everyone,” which may matter when the jury is deciding whether Google violated class members’ rights, knowingly or otherwise. *Id.* at 4. Mr. Pichai repeated his mantra that “Google is committed to ... putting you in control of what you choose to share.” *Id.* And he also hinted at some of the incentives for Google to abandon that commitment with respect to the mobile app ecosystem:

[W]e know Google’s continued success is not guaranteed. Google operates in highly competitive and dynamic global markets, I which prices are free or falling. ... For example, people have more ways to search for information than ever before — and increasingly this is happening outside of only a search engine. Often the answer is just a click or an app away.

Id. at 3. This evidence contextualizes Google’s conduct and sheds light on its motives: Google’s business was threatened by users’ ongoing migration to a mobile ecosystem that did not depend on Google’s crown jewel, Google Search. Google’s motives are relevant to its state of mind and the offensiveness of its conduct.

Google’s principal claim of prejudice is once again that this evidence is irrelevant. *See* Mot. 5. It is not, for reasons explained above. Google’s attempts to explain away Mr. Pichai’s public statements make little sense. For example, Google argues that Mr. Pichai’s statements were “about Google’s general privacy practices,” Mot. 4, which the Court credited in holding that the Judge Tse did not commit clear error by excusing Mr. Pichai from an obligation to appear live at

1 trial. But it is another thing altogether to exclude evidence based on that conclusion. Google’s
 2 overall privacy practices by definition include the practices at issue in this case, which are
 3 inconsistent with Mr. Pichai’s testimony. Google’s secondary argument—that there is no
 4 “connection between these statements and the functioning of GA for Firebase”—is also a non
 5 sequitur. Mot. 4. Mr. Pichai’s testimony is relevant because, sworn to tell the truth, he testified to
 6 the public and its representatives that Google’s users can choose which categories of data Google
 7 collects and stores. Mr. Pichai promised that Google’s users can decide what Google collects; of
 8 course he would not also testify about the tools Google uses to break that promise. Last, Google
 9 argues that some of Mr. Pichai’s testimony referred to “preloaded apps on an Android phone.” *Id.*
 10 Google overlooks that non-Google apps can be preloaded, and in fact the Chair explicitly
 11 referenced one—“Amazon.” Santacana Ex. D (PX-28) at 173:1–7. These apps may include the
 12 Firebase and Google Mobile Ads SDKs. And it is hard to believe that users would perceive the
 13 (s)WAA privacy controls to offer different functionality based on whether an app is preloaded.

14 Google’s attorney argument about what Mr. Pichai meant to say is neither authoritative nor
 15 relevant to this motion. It is not authoritative because only Mr. Pichai knows what was in his mind,
 16 and Google fought to exclude him from trial. Having won that dispute, Google lacks the evidence
 17 to establish Mr. Pichai’s intent or clarify his testimony. And Google’s attorney argument is
 18 irrelevant to this motion because *what* Mr. Pichai said matters, not just *why* he said it. Those
 19 watching Mr. Pichai’s testimony heard his words; they did not hear him explain his reasons.

20 Google also argues that Mr. Pichai’s congressional testimony “poses an obvious and
 21 heightened risk of prejudice,” but it does not explain why. Mot. 6. The only case Google cites for
 22 that proposition involved *negative* congressional testimony given by a Tylenol executive,
 23 concerning a wholly distinct product failure. *See In re Tylenol (Acetaminophen Mktg., Sales Procs.*
 24 *& Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 181 F. Supp. 3d 278, 299 (E.D. Pa. 2016) (excluding congressional
 25 testimony about manufacturing defect in case regarding unrelated *design* defect, except to the
 26 extent that defendants “open the door” by arguing that they “compl[ied] with FDA regulations”).
 27 Whatever prejudice was risked in that case is not possible here, because Mr. Pichai gave *positive*
 28 testimony concerning Google’s purported *companywide* privacy protections. His testimony could

1 harm Google's defense only if it is inconsistent with Google's conduct in this case. That would
2 not be unfair prejudice.

3 The jury should be permitted to review Mr. Pichai's public statements and weigh the
4 importance of Mr. Pichai's testimony for themselves. That is the purpose of the jury, not a motion
5 *in limine*. *SEC v. Sabrdaran*, 2016 WL 7826653, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2016) (denying
6 defendant's motion *in limine* because it "[went] to weighing the evidence, which is the province
7 of the jury"). There is no reason to doubt jurors' ability to give appropriate weight to this evidence.

8 **C. Google's Internal Reaction to the Public Revelation of a Privacy and Consent**
9 **Failure Involving Web & App Activity**

10 Google also seeks to exclude evidence of Google's response to another privacy scandal
11 involving the Web & App Activity settings. In August 2018, the Associated Press reported that
12 when users turned off the Location History setting, Google relies on the Web & App Activity
13 privacy controls to collect location information anyway. *See* Ryan Nakashima, *AP Exclusive:*
14 *Google Tracks Your Movements, Like It or Not* (Aug. 13, 2018), available at
15 <https://shorturl.at/BSkqL>; Dkt. 478-13 (PX-198) (explaining the timeline of Google's response to
16 the article) Google's reaction to this story is relevant to Google's state of mind, the reasonable
17 expectation of privacy, consent and permission, and offensiveness. Google's records illustrate that
18 Google's most senior executives knew the Web & App Activity privacy control is misleading.

19 Although Google now argues that this issue was not about Web & App Activity, both the
20 AP article itself and Google's reaction prove the opposite. *See id.* (explaining that the "Web &
21 App Activity" setting causes the unexpected behavior). In PX-200, for example, Google
22 employees [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED] Dkt. 478-17 (PX-200). [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]⁵ Google is

25 ⁵ *See* Dkt. 478-14 (PX-195) at -741 ([REDACTED])

26 [REDACTED] Dkt. 478-16 (PX-199) at -088

27 [REDACTED] Dkt.
28 [REDACTED]

able to argue that the Web & App Activity privacy controls are irrelevant to that story only because

[REDACTED] See

Mao Ex. 22 (PX-196) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] And good thing, too: As the record in this case proves, further investigations may have revealed that the location issue reported in the AP article was only the tip of the iceberg with the Web & App Activity privacy controls.

Google's internal focus on the Web & App Activity privacy controls in the aftermath of the AP story is important for three reasons.

First, Google employees' attention to one respect in which the Web & App Activity privacy controls were [REDACTED] see Dkt. 478-14 (PX-195) at -741, should have caused a broader effort to identify and cure any other respects in which those controls were misleading. The fact that Google nonetheless failed to address other known problems with the Web & App Activity privacy controls is relevant to Google's intent and the offensiveness of its conduct.

Second, the severity of Google's internal reaction to the AP story also demonstrates that a public revelation of a violation of user consent is an extremely serious event, which is relevant to the offensiveness element. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Dkt. 478-14 (PX-195) at -741. The organizers of that meeting [REDACTED] no small thing for a company as successful as Google. Dkt. 478-15 (PX-204); see also (PX-210) [REDACTED]

Google's response was directed by the company's most senior executives. That includes Mr.

478-17 (PX-200) [REDACTED]"); Dkt. 478-18 (PX-201) [REDACTED]

Dkt. 478-20 (PX-202) at -151

Ex. B (PX-207) at -928 (

Dkt. 478-19 (PX-215) at -080 [REDACTED]

Third, this evidence bears on Mr. Pichai's state of mind when he repeated in his sworn congressional testimony, his New York Times op-ed, and his article on Google's website that users can control whether Google collects their data. The documents reflect that [REDACTED]

Google does not come remotely close to carrying its burden to prove prejudice that substantially outweighs the probative value of this evidence. Google's sole argument is that these documents relate only to Google's "Location History" setting. As we have explained, that is false.

Finally, Google seeks to exclude a number of documents that reflect parts of the history and development of the Web & App Activity privacy controls, which of course are the settings at issue in this case. These documents show, among other things, that Google's representations about

14

1 those privacy controls were overseen by the company's highest executives, including Mr. Pichai.
 2 Executive involvement often inspires especially careful scrutiny, diminishing the likelihood that
 3 Google's misrepresentations about the Web & App Activity privacy controls were a mistake. This
 4 evidence is therefore relevant to Google's state of mind, the offensiveness of its conduct, the
 5 reasonableness of users' expectations of privacy, and permission and consent.

6 Some of the exhibits that Google seeks to exclude show that Google's most senior
 7 executives were personally involved with the Web & App Activity privacy controls from the start.

8 PX-152, for example, shows that [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED] Dkt. 478-1 (PX-
 12 152).⁷ PX-153 reflects that [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] Dkt. 478-2 (PX-

14 153) at -816. PX-154 contains [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] Dkt. 478-3 (PX-154). At this meeting, [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] *Id.* at -

17 255 [REDACTED]). This

18 evidence provides important context for the Web & App Activity privacy controls. It also shows
 19 that they are important enough to merit the personal attention of Google's executives, and it
 20 suggests that Google's representations about those settings were carefully considered, not
 21 inadvertent.

22 Google also seeks to exclude evidence that after the AP story, it attempted to mollify the
 23 public with superficial changes to the Web & App Activity privacy controls, leaving intact their
 24 core problem—[REDACTED] For example, Google claimed

25 to create "retention controls" for Web & App Activity data, which purport to cause the deletion of
 26 user data. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 478-34 (PX-244); Dkt. 478-28 (PX-273); Dkt. 478-27 (PX-277). But [REDACTED]

27 _____
 28 ⁷ The filename of this document, which is included in metadata that Google produced but did not
 file, is "[REDACTED]."

[REDACTED] Dkt. 478-26 (PX-243) at -702
 [REDACTED]).⁸ Google’s decision to implement—and
 congratulate itself on—these “improvements,” knowing full well that they do not address the
 unseen collection of (s)WAA-off data, reflects on Google’s intent and the offensiveness of its
 conduct with respect to the data at issue in this case.

There is no merit to Google’s argument that this evidence is only about what happens when
 the Web & App Activity privacy controls are *on*, not when it is *off*. Dkt. 523 at 5. For one thing,
 Google’s assertion is false, as explained above. And for another, the Court previously rejected this
 distinction, ordering the very discovery Google seeks to exclude over this exact objection. Dkt. 85
 at 2 (“The Court doesn’t find this distinction particularly persuasive and agrees with plaintiffs that
 ‘documents describing what happens when WAA is turned on may bear on what happens (or does
 not happen) when WAA is turned off.’”). Google’s renewed objection should be rejected for the
 same reasons.

IV. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Court should deny Google’s fifth motion in limine.

Dated: July 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Mark C. Mao

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)

mmao@bsflp.com

Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)

⁸ See also, e.g., Dkt. 479-35 (PX-226) at -483 (discussing retention controls); Dkt. 478-31 (PX-269) at -840 (email regarding “[REDACTED]”); *id.* at -845 (national press writing that “Google is a step ahead of other internet giants ... which don’t provide ways to easily delete large batches of dated posts”). Google also made other similarly ineffective “improvements” to the Web & App Activity privacy controls. See Dkt. 478-30 (PX-263) [REDACTED]

brichardson@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile (415) 999 9695

David Boies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
dboies@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Telephone: (914) 749-8200

James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jlee@bsfllp.com
Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)
rbaeza@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800
Miami, FL 33131
Telephone: (305) 539-8400
Facsimile: (305) 539-1307

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334
alanderson@bsfllp.com
M. Logan Wright, CA Bar No. 349004
mwright@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (813) 482-4814

Bill Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
srabin@susmangodfrey.com
Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)
sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
Alexander P. Frawley
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
Ryan Sila
rsila@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
One Manhattan West, 50th Floor
New York, NY 10001
Telephone: (212) 336-8330

Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)

1 abonn@susmangodfrey.com
2 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
3 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067
5 Telephone: (310) 789-3100

6 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
7 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
8 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
9 rmcgee@forthepeople.com
10 Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 238027)
11 mram@forthepeople.com
12 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
13 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor
14 Tampa, FL 33602
15 Telephone: (813) 223-5505
16 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28